REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 10-16 have been amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the action mailed September 10, 2004, is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,833,627 to Leszczynski ("Leszczynski"). The Examiner rejected claims 2-5, 7-12, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leszczynski in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,532 to Nakayama et al. ("Nakayama"). The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leszczynski in view of Nakayama and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,816 to Agrawal ("Agrawal").

Section 103(a) Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Leszczynski. Claim 1, as amended, recites a system that has an inter-character-class spacing amount setting table for line composition. The inter-character-class spacing amount setting table includes a plurality of character classes grouping similar characters. The inter-character-class spacing table defines inter-character spacing amounts between a character class of a previous character and a character class of a next character within a pair of contiguous characters.

Claim 1 also recites a basic settings mode and a detailed settings mode operable to receive an inter-character spacing amount input from a user of a desktop publishing ("DTP") system. The basic settings mode modifies the inter-character spacing amounts using a character class relationship table defining a relationship between the character class for the previous character and the character class for the next character. The detailed settings mode modifies the inter-character spacing amounts directly, without using the character class relationship table.

The Examiner states that Leszczynski discloses Applicant's inter-character-class spacing amount setting table at col. 4, lines 42-45, which reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

> Data on character widths are stored in Character Width Tables in memory portion A. Data for spacings between characters are stored on Kerning Tables in memory portion B.

Specifically, the Examiner states that the disclosure of a kerning table discloses Applicant's inter-character-class spacing amount setting table. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited section only discloses that a kerning table having information on spacing between characters is stored in memory. Kerning tables define spacing for one or more particular character pairs, not character class pairs. Leszczynski does not disclose or suggest a kerning table in which characters are grouped into a plurality of character classes.

The Examiner also states that Leszczynski suggests a basic settings mode and a detailed settings mode for setting inter-character spacing amounts. The Examiner acknowledges that Leszczynski does not specifically disclose a basic settings mode or a detailed settings mode, but asserts that they would be obvious in light of Leszczynski's basic mode of operation. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Leszczynski's basic mode of operation is to automatically correct a contour of a character glyph in order to adjust a line of text. *See* Abstract; col. 2, lines 24-39. Leszczynski does not suggest a basic and a detailed settings mode operable to receive an inter-character spacing amount input from a DTP system user. In contrast, a DTP system user in Leszczynski does not provide any inter-character spacing amount input. Additionally, Leszczynski does not disclose a basic settings mode in which the inter-character spacing amounts are modified using a character class relationship table defining a relationship between the character class for the previous character and the character class for the next character. Leszczynski fails to disclose or suggest any modification of the inter-character spacing amounts using a character class-relationship table Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 6 stands rejected as unpatentable over Leszczynski in view of Nakayama and Agrawal. Claim 6, as amended, recites a DTP system "operable to receive a DTP system user input setting an optimum value, a minimum value, and a maximum value for the inter-character spacing amount."

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine Leszczynski, Nakayama, and Agrawal to achieve claim 6 because the three references each deal with text layout and additionally because Agrawal provides a graphical user interface to set spacing

amounts. Applicant respectfully disagrees. None of the cited references provide for a DTP system user input setting different values for an inter-character spacing amount for use in line composition. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Leszczynski does not disclose or suggest a DTP system user input for setting an inter-character spacing amount.

Nakayama discloses a method for automatically correcting an inter-character spacing for over-kerned glyphs brought too close together. *See* col. 2, lines 31-36. Nakayama, however, does not disclose a DTP system user input for setting an inter-character spacing nor does Nakayama disclose or suggest the setting of an optimum, minimum, and maximum inter-character spacing value for a pair of contiguous characters.

Agrawal discloses a technique for placing text around page objects such as polygons. *See* Abstract. In Agrawal, a line of text can be broken up into a plurality of "spans" that can be formatted to avoid intersecting with the page objects or other constraints. *See* col. 5, line 59 to col. 6, line 5. The Examiner states that Agrawal discloses a user input of inter-character spacing at col. 8, line 64 to col. 9, line 4, which reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

> The third technique applied by the CUS module, which is applied by the Exclude Span routine, involves applying three span criteria to each span. The span criteria are MINWIDTH, LEFTAWAY, and RIGHTAWAY. MINWIDTH sets a minimum width for a span, LEFTAWAY sets a minimum clearance between the span and the left edge of the constraint, and RIGHTAWAY sets a minimum clearance between the span and the right edge of the constraint.

The cited section of Agrawal discloses parameters for a span defining the width of the span and a distance required between a span and one or more constraints. The parameters of a span do not disclose or suggest defining an inter-character spacing amount. In fact, the span is populated with characters after the span is defined. *See* col. 6, lines 3-5. Agrawal does not disclose or suggests an input of a DTP system user setting an optimal, minimum, or maximum value for inter-character spacing. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 stands rejected as unpatentable over Leszczynski in view of Nakayama. Claim 7, as amended, recites "an inter-character-class spacing amount setting table having spacing

amounts set by a DTP system user and saved, the inter-character-class spacing amount setting table saved in the file being accessible and modifiable by a user in either the basic settings mode or in the detailed settings mode."

The Examiner states that Leszczynski discloses a user modification of the inter-character-class spacing amount setting table at col. 2, lines 61-64, which read, in pertinent part, as follows:

> In the design mode, different representation of a given character or parts of a given character are designed and stored, and then recalled for automatically changing input characters.

The design mode in Leszczynski can allow a user to design replacement character glyphs or portions of replacement character glyphs and store them for later use in the automatic typesetting system. The replacement character glyphs, for example, can have modified serifs or other glyph attributes that change the appearance of the glyph face. *See* col. 9, line 67-col. 10, line 16. The designed character glyph can be used to replace another character glyph during a typesetting operation. *See* col. 9, line 68-col. 10, line 2. The design of a replacement glyph, however, fails to disclose or suggest the user modification of a inter-character-class spacing amount setting table that defines inter-character spacing amounts between a previous character class and a next character class. The design mode only allows for the abstract creation of a modified glyph and does not define any spacing relationship between glyphs. For the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 stands rejected as unpatentable over Leszczynski in view of Nakayama. Claim 8, as amended, recites "a basic settings mode operable to receive an input from a DTP system user for modifying the inter-character class spacing amounts using a character class relationship table." For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 8 as well as claims 9-14, which depend from claim 8, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 stands rejected as unpatentable over Leszczynski. Claim 15, as amended, recites a DTP system "having a basic settings mode and a detailed setting mode operable to

receive an inter-character spacing amount input from a DTP system user." For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 16 stands rejected as unpatentable over Leszczynski in view of Nakayama. Claim 16, as amended, recites "a basic settings mode operable to receive an input from a DTP system user for modifying the inter-character spacing amounts using a character class relationship table." For at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10 December, 2004

Brian Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50238134.doc